Ī	Case 2:06-cr-00442-MAT [	Document 14	Filed 11/30/06	Page 1 of 2
01				
02				
03				
04				
05				
06				
07	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON			
08	AT SEATTLE			
09	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	) Case	No. 06-594-JPD	
10	Plaintiff,	)		
11	v.		DER DENYING S FION TO EXTEN	
12	JONG CHUN BAE,		E INDICTMENT	ID TIME TO
13	Defendant.	)		
14		)		
15	On November 30, 2006, the parties to the above-captioned matter filed a Stipulated Motion to Extend Time to File Indictment. Dkt. No. 13. The motion argued that granting a continuance would satisfy the "ends of justice" by providing the parties additional time "necessary to review discovery materials, investigate the facts and to negotiate a resolution to this matter." <i>Id.</i> at 1. In addition, they argued that failure to grant the extension would deny defendant his right to have a reasonable amount of time to prepare for trial. <i>Id.</i> Congress, however, "did not intend the 'ends of justice' exclusion to be granted as a matter of course but rather [intended it] to be used sparingly and only when necessary." <i>United States v. Lewis</i> , 980 F.2d 555, 560 (9th Cir. 1992) (internal citations omitted). Hence, an "ends of justice" exclusion may be granted only for a specific duration when "justified [on the record] with reference to the facts as of the time the delay is ordered." <i>United States v.</i>			
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26	Ramirez-Cortez, 213 F.3d 1149, 1154 (9th Cir. 2000). Generalized assertions that the "ends			
-	of justice" will be satisfied by the granting of a continuance are insufficient. <i>Id.</i> at 1154-55.			
	ORDER DENYING STIPULATED MOTION TO EXTEND TIME PAGE -1			

Here, the parties have provided no evidence, nor adduced any facts from the record sufficient to justify granting a continuance. Instead, they have vaguely alluded to the fact that a meeting between the parties may encourage resolution of this matter, and asserted that a continuance would satisfy the ends of justice. Dkt. No. 12. These vague assertions are insufficient to justify a continuance. Moreover, the Court notes that defendant has not filed a waiver of his right to a speedy trial. The parties' motion is therefore DENIED. DATED this 30th day of November, 2006. mes P. Donoaue AMES P. DONOHUE United States Magistrate Judge 

ORDER DENYING STIPULATED MOTION TO EXTEND TIME PAGE -2